



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/738,464	12/13/2000	Thorsten Laux	P-4589	9684

24209 7590 04/11/2006

GUNNISON MCKAY & HODGSON, LLP
1900 GARDEN ROAD
SUITE 220
MONTEREY, CA 93940

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

DATE MAILED: 04/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/738,464

Applicant(s)

LAUX, THORSTEN

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2194

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: n/a.
Claim(s) objected to: n/a.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: n/a.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to claim 6 does not overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection because the newly added limitation "a tangible computer readable medium having embedded therein" is not limited to a physical computer media. Examiner suggests amending the claim to recite "a storage medium" or replacing the word "embedded" with "stored" to overcome the 35 USC 101 rejection.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the Final Office Action dated 01/24/2006, applicant argues:

(1) Since Shoji taught that each of the databases is queried database by database, there is no basis for assuming that driver 720 accesses the various drivers to provide the query to the database [p. 10, lines 21 - 32]; and

(2) There is no reason to combine Shoji with DiDomizio because Shoji does need to construct an index file to speed up searching and DiDomizio requires accessing a LDAP structure.

In response to argument (1), examiner respectfully disagrees because although Shoji have separate queries for each database, Shoji also discloses combining all the queries with a logic relationships to search all the databases [col. 5, lines 45 - 60]. The display 770 is associated with the interface driver 720; therefore, the input from the display is sent to the interface driver 720. All the queries are combined and sent to the driver 720 as one query because the driver 720 contains a function that allows an application 724 to specify the databases to be searched and the search criteria [col. 5, lines 39 - 45].

As to argument (2), examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that DiDomizio does not disclose searching an index file and accessing a LDAP structure is not the same as searching an index file.